

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

TRISTATE ROOFING INC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PROROOING NW INC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01516-RAJ-BAT

**ORDER REGARDING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
STRIKE AND TO SEAL**

On May 2, 2022, the Court denied Plaintiff Tristate Roofing Inc. ("Tristate")'s motion for sanctions against Defendant ProRoofing NW Inc. Dkt. 72. Embedded in Plaintiff's reply, is a motion to strike and seal references to settlement negotiations contained in the parties' filings.

Dkt. 66. Specifically, Plaintiff asks the Court to strike the following from the record:

- (i) Lines 21–22 of page 5, line 3 of page 8 through line 23 of page 10, and line 24 of page 10 through line 17 of page 12 of Defendant ProRoofing NW Inc.'s ("ProRoofing") opposition brief;
- (ii) Paragraphs 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, 25, 30–32, and 40–59 in the Declaration of Cheryl Burgess; and
- (iii) Exhibits 8–27 to the Declaration of Ms. Burgess.

Plaintiff asks the Court to seal the following documents:

- (i) ProRoofing's opposition brief;
- (ii) The Declaration of Cheryl Burgess; and (iii) Exhibits 8–27 to the Declaration of Ms. Burgess.

Finally, Tristate requests that ProRoofing be ordered to file unsealed copies of its

1 Opposition Brief and the Declaration of Ms. Burgess with the following redacted:

- 2 (i) Lines 21–22 of page 5, line 18 of page 8 through line 10 of page 9, and
3 line 19 of page 9 through line 7 of page 10 of ProRoofing’s opposition
4 brief; and
5 (ii) Lines 18–19 and 22–26 of page 1, lines 11–13 and 19–25 of page 2, line
6 26 of page 3 through line 3 of page 4, and lines 1–3 of page 6.

7 The Court requests further briefing on Tristate’s motion. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**
8 that ProRoofing, Inc. shall file a surreply to Tristate’s motion to strike and/or seal (Dkt. 66) by
9 **May 23, 2022**. No response to the surreply is necessary.

10 Dated this 16th day of May, 2022.

11 

12 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23